* ******  /  /  /  /  /  /  /  /  /  /  /
* ******
COMPEL DISCOVERY
ved But Not Satisfactory)
erved
(name of party from whom discovery sough
ice of motion to compel discovery filed in this cas
d and is attached to the notice of service of
d and is attached to the house of service of
ed in this case as Paper No A reply w
ice of reply to response filed in this case as Paper
ice of reply to respond the and the case at the
en unable to resolve the following issues raised in
een unable to resolve the following issues raised in
een unable to resolve the following issues raised in
en unable to resolve the following issues raised in
e

12-12020-mg Doc 7546 Filed 09/04/14 Entered 09/16/14 14:32:57 Main Document Pg 2 of 10

response at pages	, and in the reply at pages
A certificate of compliance with L	ocal Rule 104.7 is attached hereto.
Wherefore, it is requested that the o	court
review the motion to compel, response and	reply
and rule on the issues set forth above.	
Date Signature	-
	<del>-</del>
rinted Name Ba	P r Number
	<u> </u>
ddress	A
	<del>-</del>
ity/State/Zip	С
	<u>-</u>
hone No.	P Fax No.

Case No. 12-12020 (MG)

Chapter 11

Jointly Administered

Respectfully submitted:

TOM FRANKLIN, PRO SE

WHERESAS ALL FACTORS DULY TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION, The Plaintiff request that THE DEBTORS REQUEST SHOULD BE DENIED.

Of Pro Se , Counsel:

Respectfully submitted,

TOM FRANKLIN Pro Se Appellant

5633 OAK GROVE ROAD FORT WORTH, TEXAS 76134

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served by US Mailed and all other parties listed below **via** U.S. Mail on this, 2 second day of September, 2014,

Tom Franklin, Pro Se

5633 OAK GROVE ROAD FORT WORTH, TEXAS 76134

# **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served by US Mailed and all other parties listed below **via** U.S. Mail on this, 2 second day of September, 2014,

Tom Franklin, Pro Se

- 1. The creditor is owed the money by the debtor
- 2. The debtor was not provided equal access to the debtor
- 3. This a legitimate creditor claim
- 4. The creditor has suffered extreme hardship
- 5. Dismissing this credit claim would be unjust
- 6. I vote for continuing my claim
- 1. The Debtor has acted in bad faith in the implementation of this chapter 13 bankruptcy. The Bankruptcy Court is charged with the responsibility of applying the bankruptcy code under

which debtors are attempting to re-organize, while endeavoring to insure that all parties in interest receive fair and equitable treatment of their claims in interest and not the MOVANT. In re UNR Industries. Inc. 726 F.2d 26. The debtor does have adequate on his house and living quarters in so far as the property is concerned. The debtor does have employment which is sufficient to take care of his housing obligations.

- 2. Bankruptcy Filing are not prohibited by the court; especially in view when a person is trying to reorganize his debts.
- 3. The MOVANT' contention that the debtor is trying to manipulate the court is both true and accurate Any action taken in violation of the automatic stay is void <u>In re: Golden Plan of California</u>, <u>Inc.</u>, <u>37 B.R. 167</u>.
- 4. The MOVANT contention that the debtor is trying to manipulate the bankruptcy process is both true and substantiated especially in view of the fact that the property in question has been adequately taken care of

- 5. The movants contention that debtor has shown a pattern of conduct that doe not comport with the spirit of the Bankruptcy code provisions is groundless and without sound basis and substantiation. It is the job of the debtor to compensate the movants claim and to pay the full debt to protect both the movant and the debtor and to not take a side or become personal in any of the proceedings who is he working for.
- 6. The purpose of automatic stay is to permit the debtor to organize his or his affairs without creditor harassment and to allow orderly resolution of all claims. This is referenced to in Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C.A. Section 362. Fortier v. Dona Anna Plaza Partners, 747 F.2d 1324.
- 7. Congressional purpose in enacting automatic stay provision of the Bankruptcy Code was to grant immediate relief to debtor from creditors and also to prevent dissipation of the debtors assets before orderly distribution to creditors could be arranged; thus much weight is placed upon the value of preserving the debtor's estate. Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C.A. section 362(a)(1,2). <u>U.S. v. ILCO, Inc. 48 B.R. 1016.</u>
- 8. The automatic stay provision of bankruptcy code is designed to be defensive shield, affording the debtor much needed "breathing spell and to prevent harassment. Matter of Kozak Farms, Inc. 47 B.R. 399. Also cited Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C.A. section 3629e).

9. The respondent believes that he has not conducted a "good faith effort" in the way that he has cooperated with this bankruptcy to allow the debtors Motion To lift automatic stay is not in the best interests of the debtor at this time. This is a large amount of court rationale which states that the court must go to extraordinary lengths to issue that bankruptcies on the part of the debtor are given a fair and an impartial to have their bankruptcies are given proper attention; this is not direct to the federal court but rather to the movants attorneys and their fiscal representatives who try to use every legal tactical opportunity to have the debtors bankruptcies dismissed. The respondent believes he has provided the movant with full cooperation and has not damaged the property in question because it is in good condition and will continue to stay in good condition because of the kind of just person which he is. The debtor has been steadfast in his obligations to the trustee office.

WHEREAS ALL things being given proper consideration the debtor; respectfully request that the

Honorable Court allow his bankruptcy stay to continue.

Respectfully submitted:

Whereas all factor dully taken into consideration this claim should be allowed to continued.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

TOM FRANKLIN ET AL, PRO SE

5633 Oak Grove Road Fort Worth, Texas 76134

### CERTIFICATE OF SERICE

of September, 2013, a true and I, Tom Franklin, hereby certify that on this 4th day correct copy of the foregoing legal instrument was mailed, certified mail, return receipt requested to the following listed person who are entitled to have an interest in the out come of this case:

#### Debtor

KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS &

FRANKEL LLP

Kenneth H. Eckstein

Douglas H. Mannal

Joseph A. Shifer

1177 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036

Telephone: (212) 715-9100

Facsimile: (212) 715-8000

Co-Counsel for the ResCap Liquidating

Trust

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

Gary S. Lee

Norman S. Rosenbaum

Jordan A. Wishnew

Meryl L. Rothchild

250 West 55th Street

New York, New York 10019

Telephone: (212) 468-8000

Facsimile: (212) 468-7900

Co-Counsel for the ResCap Liquidating

Trust

## Respectfully submitted

Tom Franklin, Pro Se Tanphai 5633 Oak Grove Road

Fort Worth, Texas 761134